

honor his valor and unstinting service to our country.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CREATE EQUITABLE RETIREMENT ELIGIBILITY FOR MILITARY RESERVE TECHNICIANS

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 2001

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill that would provide comparable retirement eligibility for Military Reserve Technicians as applies to those on active duty.

For years, Congress has passed legislation on behalf of active duty service members and active duty retirees. Sometimes, full-time military reserve employees enjoy collateral benefits from this legislation. But often, they are not included. We are talking about Guard and Reserve employees who come to work in uniform each day; they are assigned to their military reserve unit and meet all military standards. They perform comparable, usually identical, military functions but in a civil service status. These are the employees that make our Guard and Reserve such a "good deal" for our country. Our reserve units can perform virtually all of the missions as their active duty counterparts at a fraction of the price because these dedicated full-time employees are available to provide continuity between unit training assembly, also known as drill, weekends.

Our Armed Forces are undergoing a thorough analysis and transformation to insure we are able and equipped to meet the evolving national security needs of tomorrow. It is obvious that the Guard and Reserve will continue to have vital missions and roles in this transformation. The Air Force has fully integrated the Guard and Reserve into its Aerospace Expeditionary Forces and cannot perform their scheduled rotations without them. The Army is studying the prospects of involving National Guard components in a more substantial role in Homeland Defense as recommended in the Hart-Rudman study.

Our hometown militia is here to stay, and so we must maintain benefits that will entice new young people to invest their future in the Guard and Reserves. One way to do this is to offer an attractive retirement package, similar to that of active duty members. This bill will do just that. Instead of having to wait until age 55 for a full civil service annuity, full-time military reserve technicians could retire at age 50. Or, once they have served over 20 years in civil service status, the number of years for retirement eligibility on active duty, they can retire at any age without a reduction in annuity.

It will continue to be challenging to recruit and retain young people into the armed forces. These challenges are not lost on the full-time reserve technician workforce. In many ways it will be worse, because the Reserves typically only recruit full-time staff from among

those already in the service. In other words, they have a smaller pool from which to draw. It is our responsibility to make sure the Guard and Reserves remain strong and vital, and one way to do this is to invest in their human capital.

The legislation I am introducing today is important not only to our current military reserve technicians who may meet the new retirement eligibility, but also to those new prospects who are evaluating employment alternatives as they decide with whom to invest their future. Make it a priority today to strengthen our Guard and Reserves of the future.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility and choice, so that no child is left behind:

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act, but I must point out some sections that I believe place students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) at a disadvantage. I have been contacted by several organizations with an extreme interest in these provisions of the legislation, and I would like to point out some of the concerns we share. Hopefully, when Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate meet in Conference, these provisions of this historic legislation can be addressed to ensure complete fairness to all of America's children.

I oppose the requirement in Title I and Title III for parental consent for English Language Instruction. I would like to point out that current law already includes a requirement that schools notify parents about their child's participation in bilingual and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. The provision in H.R. 1 goes further and requires every local educational agency (OEA) to obtain written parental consent before LEAs could serve limited English proficient children with appropriate bilingual instruction. In contract, LEAs using English only instruction would not have to seek such consent. In reality, this parental consent requirement would create a disincentive for schools to serve LEP students.

Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act also proposes to consolidate the current Bilingual Education Act (BEA), the Emergency Immigrant Education Program (EIEP), and the Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) into one formula driven State grant. Addressing the unique needs of limited English proficiency students has reached critical levels. The approach taken in H.R. 1, consolidating

these three programs, is counterproductive and does nothing to assist LEAs in providing adequate services for LEP and newly arrived immigrant students. I oppose the consolidation of these programs and urge the Conferees to maintain each as a separate and distinct entity.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, Title III also requires every LEA to design programs that assess LEP students in English who have attended school in the United States for three or more consecutive school years in reading or language arts, and if these students have not reached proficiency in English, the LEA will face economic penalties. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this will lead to LEAs proclaiming proficiency and removing these students from these programs whether they have learned English or not. This imposition of an arbitrary three year instructional time limit is ill advised and intrudes on the LEAs ability to help LEP students succeed. As we all realize, all students, including LEP students, come to school with diverse needs, and at different

In closing, I again want to point out my support for this legislation. However, if we truly do hope to "leave no child behind," we must look seriously at the provisions dealing with limited English proficiency students. I am hoping and trusting that the Conferees will make the right decisions on these important provisions of H.R. 1.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY MCCORMICK

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 25, 2001

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, it is with utmost pleasure and privilege that I rise today to recognize Mr. Larry McCormick for his 30 years of dedicated service to the people of Los Angeles as a news broadcaster with KTLA-TV.

Truly a multi-faceted, multi-talented, media professional, Larry has worked for over 40 years in the field of broadcasting—33 in television news. Joining KTLA in 1971 as a weatherman, Larry now serves as anchor of the station's "News at Ten Weekend Edition," and as weekday feature anchor for "News at Ten." He also co-hosts the highly-regarded "Making It: Minority Success Stories," seen every Sunday morning.

As the first African American news anchor in Los Angeles, Larry has served as a role-model for a generation of television journalists. His years of experience and reputation for honesty earned him the prestigious "Governor's Award," the highest honor presented annually by the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. Over his long journalistic career, he has also been nominated for many Emmy Awards and has been the recipient of a number of Golden Mike Awards for news excellence.